was achieved by way of a vague combination of these two conceptions. But such conceptions were not congenial to the more scientific inquirers. With the revival of learning the ancient conception of power, the *vis* of the Latin writers, the *dynamis* and *energeia* of the Greeks, came back into vogue. At that time our modern distinction between force and energy had not been achieved (it was achieved only late in the nineteenth century, and is still somewhat shakily poised). The physiologists began to replace the term [e] animal spirits ', with its too various meanings, by the term *vital force.* The new term was less open to objection just because its meaning was so utterly vague. In general it was used to mean little more than a recognition of the fact that much that goes on in the bodies of men and animals seemed inexplicable in mechanical terms. Thus the term ' vital force' came into use among the physiologists (who for the most part were but little interested in the problems of mind) to take the place of what the Greeks had called the psyche; the word [£] soul' (like the German equivalent *Seek* and the French equivalent *dme)* having become, for their liking, too much infected with spiritual implications.

Of course, the term explained nothing; but it did serve to mark a problem, the problem we have defined above as the problem of X, the problem—What is it in the living body that makes the difference between it and inanimate things ?

In so far as the psyche or soul or animating principle

was conceived, as it was by Plato, as radically different from the body and from all physical or material things, the doctrine of the psyche was duaEstic and was a variety of animism historically